



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
701 S. COURTHOUSE RD
ARLINGTON, VA 22204

Docket No. 7965-25
Ref: Signature Date

From: Chairman, Board for Correction of Naval Records
To: Secretary of the Navy

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED], USN,
XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

Ref: (a) Title 10 U.S.C. § 1552
(b) BUPERSINST 1610.10G

Encl: (1) DD Form 149 w/attachments
(2) Fitness Report & Counseling Record (W2-O6) for the reporting period 1 February 2024 to 31 January 2025
(3) NPC 1610 PERS-32 Memo, subj: [Petitioner], USN, 31 July 2024

1. Pursuant to the provisions of reference (a), Subject, hereinafter referred to as Petitioner, filed enclosure (1) with the Board for Correction of Naval Records (Board), seeking to have his naval record corrected by removing the “significant problems” evaluation from his record and ceasing “any plans to add [field] code 17” to his official military personnel file (OMPF).

2. The Board, consisting of [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] reviewed Petitioner’s allegations of error or injustice on 6 May 2026 and pursuant to its regulations, determined the corrective action indicated below should be taken on the available evidence of record. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of the enclosures, relevant portions of Petitioner’s naval records, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies.

3. The Board, having reviewed all the facts of record pertaining to Petitioner’s allegations of error and injustice, finds as follows:

a. Before applying to this Board, Petitioner exhausted all administrative remedies available under law and regulations applicable to the Department of the Navy.

b. Petitioner was issued enclosure (2), a periodic fitness report for the reporting period 1 February 2024 to 31 January 2025. The fitness report assigned Petitioner several “1.0/Below Standards” performance traits in professional expertise, mission accomplishment, and leadership. Additionally, he was assigned “2.0/Progressing” performance traits in military bearing/character and teamwork. In block 40, the Reporting Senior (RS) recommended “DFC” and “REDESIGNATION” for Petitioner’s “next career milestone(s).” In block 41, the RS noted Petitioner was “removed as the [REDACTED] on 13 February 2024 following a Center of Laboratory Medicine Services (CLMS) technical visit that detailed severe deficiencies, resulting in a failure of compliance...” The RS further noted Petitioner’s “leadership resulted in CLMS mandated sanctions and negatively impacted blood transfusion

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED], USN,
XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

services.” The RS closed by stating he had “lost confidence in [Petitioner’s] abilities as an Officer and Leader.” Petitioner, along with one other officer, was assigned a promotion recommendation of “significant problems.” Petitioner availed himself of the opportunity to submit a statement. In his statement, Petitioner explains that “to [his] surprise” he was given an adverse fitness report without first being given a letter of instruction or an opportunity to correct identified deficiencies in the laboratory department. He further stated that over his two years as a Department Head he had “been led to believe that [his] performance ha[d] been consistently above standards.” Further, he explained that because he had no prior leadership opportunities before reporting to his current assignment and his junior officer laboratory training had been curtailed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the fitness report marks were “both incorrect and unjust.” See enclosure (2).

c. Petitioner contends the “significant problems” fitness report was issued before final disposition of the alleged dereliction of duty and before a Board of Inquiry concluded its investigation into alleged dereliction of duty. He further contends the BOI results – all allegations unsubstantiated – warranted removal of the adverse report. Petitioner did not submit any supporting documentation with his petition; he only submitted a DD Form 149. See enclosure (1).

d. Navy Personnel Command (PERS 32) provided the advisory opinion (AO) at enclosure (3), determining the report was valid and recommending “the Petitioner’s record remain unchanged, unless directed by the BCNR.” The AO noted Petitioner did not provide supporting documentation, specifically the findings of the BOI nor documentation of an investigation he contends was not finalized during the reporting period. However, the AO further noted that a BOI retention recommendation would not override the RS’s authority to evaluate Petitioner’s performance. Additionally, the AO noted the RS had a responsibility to comment on significant and persistent weaknesses and “[n]othing in the member’s petition indicates the RS acted for illegal or improper purposes or that the fitness report lack[ed] rational support.”

e. Reference (b) explains that block 40 is used for “career recommendations” which must be realistic and consistent with the member’s current grade, performance, and career path. If no recommendation is appropriate, reference (b) directs entry of “NA” or “NONE.”

CONCLUSION

Upon review and consideration of all the evidence of record, the Board finds the existence of an error and injustice warranting partial relief.

The Board substantially concurred with the AO that the contested report at enclosure (2) is valid as written and filed in accordance with reference (b). The Board, noting Petitioner did not submit any supporting documentation regarding his BOI or an investigation nor was there any related documentation in his OMPF, determined there was insufficient evidence of error or injustice in the RS’s assigned performance traits, block 41 comments, and promotion recommendation. However, the Board determined block 40 is in error and unjust because “DFC” and “REDESIGNATION” are not “career milestones.”

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED], USN,
XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

RECOMMENDATION

In view of the above, the Board recommends the following corrective action:

Petitioner's naval record be corrected by redacting the "DFC" and "REDSIGNATION" entries in block 40 of the fitness report at enclosure (2) for the reporting period 1 February 2024 to 31 January 2025.

That no further changes be made to Petitioner's naval record.

4. It is certified that a quorum was present at the Board's review and deliberations, and that the foregoing is a true and complete record of the Board's proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
5. Pursuant to the delegation of authority set out in Section 6(e) of the revised Procedures of the Board for Correction of Naval Records (32 Code of Federal Regulation, Section 723.6(e)) and having assured compliance with its provisions, it is hereby announced that the foregoing corrective action, taken under the authority of Reference (a), has been approved by the Board on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy.

5/22/2026

